

**Remarks**

The Restriction Requirement contends that the claims as filed are directed to the following distinct inventions: (1) Species 1 (FIGS. 1-6) and (2) Species 2 (FIGS. 7-8). In response to the Restriction Requirement, Applicant elects, with traverse, claims 1-18 and 22-30, which are directed to the allegedly distinct species of FIGS. 1-6. Applicant also requests rejoinder of the Species 2 claims for prosecution with the Species 1 claims.


Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are sufficiently related such that a thorough search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden. Therefore, as specified in MPEP §803, "the Examiner must examine [the entire application] on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions."

Applicant requests that the Restriction Requirement be withdrawn and all pending claims examined together in the present application. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if there are any issues remaining concerning this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey B. Haendler  
Registration No. 43,652

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600  
121 S.W. Salmon Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 226-7391  
Facsimile: (503) 228-9446